

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ANGEL BARTLETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 15-13939

ALLEGAN COUNTY COURTS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the court is Plaintiff Angel Bartlett's letter, filed on the docket, and appended to which is a notation "Motion to Reconsider" (Dkt. # 9). The letter is rambling and not easily understood, but court will construe it consistent with its notation as a Motion for Reconsideration, asking the court to reconsider its summary dismissal of the Complaint in this action, (Dkt. # 8). For the reasons stated below the court will deny Plaintiff's Motion.

Subject to the court's discretion, a motion for reconsideration shall be granted only if the movant "demonstrate[s] a palpable defect by which the court and the parties . . . have been misled" and "show[s] that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(h)(3). "A 'palpable defect' is 'a defect that is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain.'" *Buchanan v. Metz*, 6 F. Supp. 3d 730, 752 (E.D. Mich. 2014) (quoting *United States v. Lockett*, 328 F. Supp. 2d 682, 684 (E.D. Mich. 2004)). The court "will not grant motions for . . . reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court." E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(h)(3).

The court originally dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint, pursuant to its screening function under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), because it failed to state a legal or factual basis on which the court could grant relief. Indeed, as it appears that Plaintiff is not in the custody of the state and she does not appear to allege violations of constitutional rights or federal laws, the court finds no basis for jurisdiction over Plaintiff's concerns. The Motion for Reconsideration does not address any of the Complaint's defects highlighted in the court's previous Opinion and Order. As the instant Motion does not assert any "palpable defect" in the court's reasoning nor does it clarify on what grounds Plaintiff seeks relief, the Motion is without merit.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. # 9) is DENIED.

s/Robert H. Cleland
ROBERT H. CLELAND
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 10, 2016

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, May 10, 2016, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
(313) 234-5522